

3936. cc. 10



A N
ACCOUNT
OF THE
CONFERENCE

I N
NICHOLAS-LANE,
February the 13th, 1734-5.

Ecquem tam Amentem esse putas, qui illud, quo vescatur,
Deum credat esse? *Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. 3.*



ACCOUNT
OF THE
CONFERENCE

IN



NICHOLSON

1852

Printed and Published by
J. G. Nichols, 10, Strand, London, W.C.

Printed and Published by
J. G. Nichols, 10, Strand, London, W.C.

AN
ACCOUNT
OF THE
CONFERENCE

HELD IN
NICHOLAS-LANE,

February 13th. 1734-5.

BETWEEN
TWO ROMISH PRIESTS, and some
PROTESTANT DIVINES.

WITH SOME
REMARKS

On a PAMPHLET, entitled,
The Two CONFERENCES, &c. truly stated.

By SAMUEL CHANDLER,

*Quod facit hic idem, perdelirum esse videtur,
Nam contra sensus ab sensibus ipse repugnat.*
Lucret.

LONDON,

Printed for J. GRAY, at the Cross Keys in the
Poultry, near Cheapside. M.DCC.XXXV.

Price One Shilling.

ACCOUNT
OF THE
CONFERENCE

NICHOLAS LANE

Two Roman Pavements and some
Pictorial Designs



BY SAMUEL CHANDLER

LONDON

Printed by J. GALT, and sold by
Messrs. J. GALT, 11, Abchurch Lane,
London, E.C. 4.



A N
ACCOUNT
OF THE
CONFERENCE

HELD IN
NICHOLAS-LANE,
February 13th. 1734-5, &c.

WHEN I saw advertised in the publick Papers, the first Account of the Conferences in *Nicholas Lane*, it gave me some Surprize and Uneasiness, as I knew nothing of the Person who drew it up, and had never been in the least consulted in the Affair, though I might have expected that *Civility*, as I was one of the Parties concerned in it. I did not, I confess, imagine, that any one of the Company would have so far

broken through the Rules of *Decency*, as to publish to the World a private Conversation, without the Leave or Approbation of the several Gentlemen by whom it was carried on: Such a Conduct is, to say the least, a Breach of Confidence and good Manners, and by no means justifiable.

As to the Account it self, though there are many Things in it true, yet 'tis hasty and incorrect, and by no means just and accurate; and therefore I do not much wonder to find that 'tis animadverted on by a second; which, whether or no it be, as the Title Page pretends, *truly stated*, I must leave to the Gentlemen present at the Conferences, and to those who will give themselves the Trouble to peruse the following Papers, to determine.

As to the first Conference, held on *Feb. 7.* I can give no Account of it, not having been present at it; nor was it originally intended that I should have been at the Second: For I was only occasionally called in, by reason of the Indisposition and Absence of that Reverend Divine of the Church of *England* who appeared at the first Debate, and was expected at the last.

In the second Conference, at which only I attended, there were two Things principally debated.

1. Whether Mr. *Barker* and Mr. *Neal* had any proper Vouchers and Authorities

to produce, in justification of what they had asserted in their Sermons at *Salters Hall*, viz. That the Papists had sometimes given the Title of *our Lord God* to the Pope?

2. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

As to the First, when the Authorities were demanded by Mr. *Morgan* and Mr. *Vaughan*, as the two Catholick Gentlemen, who were supposed to be Priests, were then called; Dr. *Hunt* told them, That Mr. *Barker* would produce them at a convenient Time, and when properly called for, though he had not then brought them with him. Upon this the good Fathers shewed their Resentment, by growing Warm and Angry, because their Expectations were not satisfied; and said, that as Mr. *Barker* and Mr. *Neal* had publickly preached a Sermon and printed it, in which they had affirmed, That this Title was given to the Pope, their Vouchers ought to have been ready when called for. On this Point they seem'd secure of their Victory, for the Evening at least, and were ready to triumph over us poor Hereticks, for having brought a Charge which we were not able to support. It might be asked here, if it were not too great a Trespass upon the Gentlemens *Modesty*, What Right they had to oblige Mr. *Barker* or Mr. *Neal* to produce their Vouchers, exactly when they were
pleased

pleased to demand them? Those Ministers did not own either of them as their *Ordinaries*, nor apprehend them to be vested with any competent Authority; and might possibly choose to lay those Vouchers before the World in a more publick Manner at a convenient Season, which I am well assured they will do, when they shall be thought necessary.

p. 22.

But however, the two Fathers had some Satisfaction in the Point, more than they expected or desired it seems, before the Company broke up. For as the Author of *the Conferences truly stated* expresses it: *See how Providence favours the good Old Cause! At this Time, a certain Gentleman came into the Room, who undertook to justify the Charge by Extracts.* If by the *good Old Cause* he means the Cause of the Protestant Religion, it must be allowed to be an *Old Cause*; since 'tis as old as our Saviour and his Apostles; and for this Reason it must be a *good Old Cause*, because it hath their *good* Authority to justify and support it. If by the *good Old Cause* he means any Thing else, he is guilty of Rudeness and Insolence to insinuate a Charge he dares not name; and I could tell him, that Treasons, Rebellions, private Assassinations, and publick Massacres, to support the Grandeur and Power of the Priests, is a Cause that all true Protestants abhor, and that hath avowed Pa-
trons

trons only to be found in the Church of *Rome*: These have been commanded and sanctified, and solemnized by publick Processions, by those *false Gods* the Popes of *Rome*, who have blasphemously received and accepted the Titles of Deity. And this was fully made good at the Conference by Mr. *John Eames*, well known to the World for his Integrity and Learning.

The first Instance he produced was from an Oration of *Christopher Marcellus*, made in the Name of the *Lateran Council* to Pope *Julius II.* in which, amongst other Things, is the following Expression: *Cura denique ut salutem, quam dedisti nobis, et vitam, et spiritum non amittamus. Tu enim* Concil. Edit. Bin. Colon. Agrip. 1618. *Pastor, Tu Medicus, Tu Gubernator, Tu Cultor, or as another Edition hath it, (Custos) Tu denique ALTER DEUS in Terris. Finally, Take care that we do not lose that Salvation (or Health) which thou hast given us; that Life and Breath. For thou art Shepherd, Thou art Physician, Thou art Governor, Thou art Husbandman (or Keeper) Thou, finally, art ANOTHER (or second) GOD on Earth.* Though the whole Passage is full of detestable Flattery, yet it was objected, that this did not come up fully to the Charge.

The Priests were then asked by Mr. *Eames*, Whether they would allow, that if it could be proved, that the Title of *Supremum numen in Terris* had been ascribed to

the Pope, it would be satisfactory? And immediately produced the following Passage out of Doctor Stapleton's Dedication to Pope Gregory XIII. whom he addresses under the Titles of, *Sanctissimus et beatissimus Pater*, and, *Pontifex optimus maximus*, *Most holy and most blessed Father*, and *Pontiff, greatest and best*. *Opusculum hoc nostrum, &c. sub tui amplissimi nominis, PLANEQUE SUPREMI IN TERRIS NUMINIS, tutela atque auspiciis in lucem emissum.* This our Work, &c. is published under the Protection and Authority of your most venerable Name, and of your evidently SUPREAM Deity or GODSHIP upon Earth. This Work of Stapleton had been revised and approved by the publick Licensers of Books; and notwithstanding this Impiety in the Dedication, was declared by them to contain nothing, *contra Fidem et bonos Mores*, contrary to Faith and Morality, and was dedicated by the Paris Printers to Pope Paul V.

Lib. VI.
Decret.
Bonif.
VIII. Con-
stit. Clem.
& Extra-
vag.

But that there might be no Pretence of Evasion for the Gentlemen, another Passage was produced by Mr. Eames from one of the Glosses, upon an Extravagant of Pope John XXII. *De verbor. signif. Cum inter*, Chap. IV. in which Gloss or Comment are these Words. *Credere autem DOMINUM DEUM NOSTRUM PAPAM, conditorem dictæ decretalis et istius, sic non potuisse statuere, prout statuit, hæreticum censeretur.*
To

To believe that OUR LORD GOD THE POPE, the Author of the said Decretal, could not so ordain as he hath ordained, ought to be esteemed heretical. This Passage is fully and directly to the Charge; and appeared satisfactory to the whole Company.

The Author, however, of the *Conferences truly stated*, is pleased to say, *This, and the rest of the Story, did not appear satisfactory to the Catholicks then present; though they were complaisant enough not to dispute the Gentleman's Fidelity in making his curious Extracts.* Their not disputing his Fidelity was not the Effect of *Complaisance* but *Necessity*. For the Gentleman, who produced the Extracts, publickly offered to shew them the very Books from whence they were made, the very next Day. But they had heard enough, and did not care for the Conviction of Eye-sight; and as one of them declares publickly, that he was an utter Stranger to them till he was then let into the Secret, he must allow the Extracts to be very great Curiosities.

But when he affirms they did not appear *satisfactory* to the Catholicks then present, I must tell the Gentleman that he forgets himself; and I will put him in mind of a Circumstance or two, that I believe will abundantly refresh his Memory. It was objected, that these were Titles given only by particular Persons to the Popes, and

that therefore the Church of *Rome* was not chargeable with, or answerable for them. To this, amongst many other Things which were said, I replied, That neither Mr. *Barker* nor Mr. *Neal* had charged it on the Church of *Rome*. The Sermons were then demanded; I immediately produced them. Mr. *Morgan* read the Passages himself, and frankly owned, that the two Ministers had not laid the Charge on the Church of *Rome*; ingenuously confessing, that the Thing asserted by them, viz. That *the Title of LORD GOD had been given to the Popes*, was sufficiently made good. This produced the deserved Acknowledgement in his Favour from my self, and many others of the Company, That he behav'd with great Candidness and Honour.

Mr. *Morgan* farther at the same Time allowed, that such Titles as had been proved to be given to the Pope were blasphemous; and said, 'twas no wonder that Men elated with *Power*, and surrounded with Flatterers, should receive them. And for the Truth of all this I appeal to Mr. *Morgan's* own Conscience, and the Honour of every Gentleman present.

622 The Representation therefore given by the Author of the Account of *the Conferences truly stated*, viz. That as the Sentence stands in Mr. *Barker's* famous *Harrangue*, as he rudely calls his Sermon, any of *his Hearers* would naturally understand him

him as speaking of the Papists in general, is neither candid nor true. 'Tis not *candid*, because Mr. Morgan at the Conference frankly cleared the Words of Mr. Barker as well as Mr. Neal from that Sense. Nor is it *true*, because his Words will not really bear it. *The Pope*, says Mr. Barker, is called his Holiness, &c. and sometimes OUR LORD GOD THE POPE; which is plainly denying the latter Title to be a generally given one, or that 'tis the common and general Language of the *Romish Church*; unless *always* and *sometimes* mean the same Thing, as *Particular* and *Universal* must do in the common Language of Papists, when they call themselves *Roman Catholics*, i. e. Members of the *Particular, Universal Church of Rome*.

And although the Three mentioned Passages were all, as I remember, that were produced at the Conferences, yet I would not have Mr. Morgan and his Brother imagine, that these are all we have to alledge: We have a large Number ready, which are at their Service when they please to call for them, or think the Publication of them will be of any Use. And though our Author is pleased to tell the World, *That Pope* p. 23: *Nicholas's fine Reasoning will do no Service*, yet thus much it will prove, That this Pope assumed the Title of *God*, and argued from that Title, that no mortal could judge

Decret. him. His Words are, *Satis evidenter ostenditur, a seculari potestate nec ligari prorsus, nec solvi posse Pontificem, quem constat a pio Principe Constantino, DEUM appellatum: Nec posse DEUM ab hominibus judicari manifestum est.* It is evidently shewn, that the Pontiff, whom 'tis certain that pious Prince Constantine called God, cannot be at all bound or loosed by the secular Power: And 'tis manifest THAT GOD CANNOT BE JUDGED BY MEN. Pope Nicholas's Argument is this:

God cannot be judged by Men:

But the Pope, as *Constantine* call'd him, is God.

Therefore the Pope cannot be judged (bound or loosed) by Men.

But though this Passage proves, that the Title of God hath been assumed by, as well as given to a Pope; yet as our Author allows the Reasoning to be *ridiculous and absurd*, I shall make no Remarks on it.

I would however observe, that all Catholics do not think the Claim of the Title of God by the Pope, to be as ridiculous and absurd as this Gentleman. I believe it may be proved, that one of the greatest Kings of *France* was basely assassinated under the Influence of this very Principle, That *the Pope was God*: And one
I would

would imagine that many others amongst the Papists have been actuated by the same; otherwise 'tis very difficult to account for the Readiness and Zeal they have so often expressed in obeying the Pope's Commands, even when it hath been to commit the most outrageous Violences, and to perpetrate the most horrid and shocking Murders.

It would indeed make a Volume, to lay together all the blasphemous Titles and Ascriptions that have been given to, and received by the Popes. I will beg my Readers Patience to mention one or two Passages more, which I have taken from the Authors themselves.

The first is, from an Oration of *Antony Muretus*, Ambassador of *Francis II.* King of *France*, to Pope *Pius IV.* In that Oration there are these Words: *Summa plane omnia, ac prope divina in eo requiruntur, qui clavum in Ecclesiæ navi teneat: Cujus a nutu pendcant leges: Cujus ad pedes Reges ipsi se abjiciant: Cujus arbitrio pandatur cælum: Qui denique supra omne humanæ dignitatis fastigium erectus, Dei personam inter homines sustineat.* All the noblest, and even almost divine Qualifications, are required in him who is to hold the Helm in the Ship of the Church: Upon whose Nod the Laws are to depend: At whose Feet Kings are to prostrate themselves: At whose Pleasure Heaven is to be opened; Who finally is exalted above all
Heightb

Muret.
Orat. 5.
V. l. p. 54.
Edit. Ingolstadt.

Height of human Dignity, and is to sustain
 THE VERY PERSON OF GOD AMONGST MEN.

This he represents to the Pope himself as the common Character of all the Popes ; and accordingly in another Oration to the same Pope, he thus addresses him : *Agedum, beatissime Pater, ita te Deus ille, cujus tu Personam in Terris sustines — Ecclesiæ suæ præesse velit. May that God, most blessed Father, WHOSE PERSON YOU SUSTAIN ON EARTH, cause you long to preside over the Church.* And in another Oration to him :

Id. p. 124. Quis enim per illum, cujus locum in Terris obtines, Rerum omnium præpotentem Deum, ad istam sedem provectus, te ornatio? Who of those, that have been exalted to this See, by that God, the almighty Governor of the World, WHOSE PLACE you possess on Earth, was ever more adorned than you ?

The other Passage I shall mention, tho' of a different Nature, yet is equally profane, and is transcribed from *Paulus Æmylius*, a Popish Writer. After the famous *Sicilian Vespers*, or the Murder of the *French in Sicily*, An. 1282. the City of *Palermo* sent their Deputies to *Rome*, *Sanctos viros, Holy Men*, to beg Pardon of the Pope for the Share they had in that Massacre. When these holy Men came before Pope *Martin IV.* the Historian gives this Account of their Behaviour and Speech to him. *Ad pedes illius strati, velut pro ara hostiaque, Christum*

Paul. Æ-
myl. De
reb. gest.
Francor.
lib. 7.

Christum Agnum Dei salutes; illa etiam ex altaris mysteriis verba supplices effarentur: Qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nostri! Tertium: Qui tollis peccata mundi, dona nobis pacem. They fell prostrate at his Feet, and saluted him as Christ the Lamb of God; and with profound Humility pronounced those Words taken from the Mysteries of the Altar: O thou that takest away the Sins of the World, have Mercy upon us! O thou that takest away the Sins of the World, have Mercy upon us! And again the third Time: O thou that takest away the Sins of the World, grant us Peace. The Pope's Answer to this, was a plain Acceptance of the Title. *Pontificem respondisse: Panormitanos agere, quod fecissent, qui cum Christum pulsarent, eundem regem Judæorum salutabant: Re hostes, fando salvere jubentes.* That the People of Palermo acted by him, as those did, who when they smote Christ, saluted him King of the Jews: They said Hail to him with their Mouths, but were in reality his Enemies. Who, that reads these and the like Passages, can help thinking of that Description given by St. Paul of the Man of Sin, 2 *Thess.* ii. 4. *Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*

p. 23. As to what our Author tells us was insisted on at the Conference, that *the extravagant Expressions of particular Men, of what Rank or Dignity soever, were not chargeable on the Church in Communion with the See of Rome*; this, I apprehend, is not to the Point that was agreed to be debated, which was solely this: Whether Mr. *Barker* and Mr. *Neal* had any Vouchers for what they had asserted in their Sermons, that the Pope is sometimes called, OUR LORD GOD. This was made out and proved, to Mr. *Morgan's* and the Company's full Satisfaction. Whether this was the Language of the Church Representative or Universal, is quite another Question, that Mr. *Eames* refused to enter upon; and that was, as I am informed, never once proposed to be inquired into at the second Conference.

Session 25. However, I think it may, with too much reason, be charged on the *Romish* Church, that these, or the like Expressions, are a Language that she is very far from disapproving or condemning. 'Tis well known that the Council of *Trent* committed the whole Affair of the revising and censoring of Books to the *Roman Pontiff*, *ut ejus judicio atque auctoritate terminetur et evulgetur*; that it might be determined and published by his Judgment and Authority. In virtue of this Decree, the Popes are the authorised Licensers of the Church Representative;

sentative; and whatever Expressions are allowed by the Popes, are also allowed by the Council of *Trent*, who committed the whole Affair of the Revival of Books to their Care. Now the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, from whence I have taken Pope *Nicholas's* fine Reasoning, *That he can't be judg'd by Mortals because he is God*, was publish'd by Pope *Gregory XIII.* his Order; who in his Bull prefix'd to it, tells us, That he had chosen several *ex fratribus nostris sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus, adjuncto etiam aliquorum doctrinæ et pietate insignium virorum studio*; several of his Brethren the Cardinals, and other learned and pious Men; to whom he had committed the Care *revidendi, corrigendi, et expurgandi*, of revising, correcting, and expunging both the Errors of pious and catholick Men, and what had been added in the Margin or Text, contrary to the Catholick Faith by impious Writers, in the *Decretum Gratiani*, the *Decretals* of Pope *Gregory IX.* the *Sextus Decretum*, the *Clementines*, and *Extravagants*; as well without, as with the *Glosses*; and that he had taken care that they should be *faithfully and uncorruptly printed*. So that this Body of *Canon Law* is authentick, and allowed by the Church Representative to be such, because declared so by Pope *Gregory XIII.* to whom, as one of the

C

Popes,

Popes, the whole Affair of Books was committed by them. And in this Book, revised, corrected, and expunged from all Errors, Pope *Nicholas's* claim of GODSHIP stands; and his Argument from it, that he could not be judged, bound or loosed, by any Mortal.

Besides, let it be considered, that the Passage cited from the Oration of *Marcellus* to Pope *Julius II.* *Tu denique alter Deus in Terris, Thou art another God on Earth,* was spoken to the Pope at the Head of the *Lateran* Council. 'Twas heard by the Council, spoken in their Names by their Orator, and never contradicted, or objected to by them. They did consequently assent to it. 'Twas the Council's Language, that he was *DEUS ALTER in Terris.* And therefore that *the Pope is God on Earth* is the Language of the Church of *Rome*, as far as the Approbation of this Council can make it so.

'Tis therefore in vain that the Author of the two *Conferences truly stated*, endeavours to justify the Church of *Rome* from the Charge of approving this Language. The Instance of *Littleton's* applying, *Diva Majestas* and *Numen* to King *Charles II.* and their not being excepted against by any Protestant Church, which he urges as parallel, is far from coming up to the Point. For what hath the Language of a
private

private Writer, a single *flattering Sycophant*, to do with the Doctrine of the Protestant Churches? To render the Cases parallel, he should have produced an Assembly or Council of Protestant Divines, with their Prince at the Head of them, addressing the Prince by their Orator, under the Title of *Diva Majestas*, or *Numen*, or *Deus alter in Terris*. When he can do this, I'll allow the Ascription of such Characters to be the Act of such a Council, and the Language of the Church represented by them, unless the Council publicly disown it, or censure the *Speaker*.

But I shall pass on to the second Subject of the Conference, which was *Transubstantiation*; only observing, that as my being present at the Conference was purely accidental, so I knew nothing of the Argument that was to be managed, and therefore could not make any Preparation for it. Whereas the Gentlemen on the Popish Side knew their Subject, had made themselves ready for the Debate, and seem'd secure of an entire Victory: And the Protestants themselves, I find, were in pain for fear of their Enemies; for as the Gentleman modestly tells us, in his *Conferences truly stated*, he was induced to suspect, *they thought* ^{p. 24.} *they had no despicable Antagonist to engage.*

That the Debate might be carried on with more Order, Dr. *Talbot Smith* was chosen Chairman; and whereas the Author

of the *Conferences truly stated*, says: *I hope he hath thanked the Author of the Narrative for telling the World, he performed the Office very well; I have a Commission from the Doctor to tell him, that he knew nothing of the drawing up, or publishing that Narrative, and was far from being pleased with it when he perused it.*

Mr. *Morgan* opened this Part of the Conference by reading to the Company the Doctrine relating to the *Eucharist*, as decreed by the Council of *Trent*, and the Words of Institution from the New Testament; having immediately before this very frankly declared, *That as he was not allowed to argue either from Tradition or Antiquity, he would abide by the Words of Scripture in their Grammatical and reasonable Construction*; which every one present allowed to be a fair and honourable Proceedure.

After the Decree of the Council, and the Words of Scripture were read, he called on Dr. *Hunt* to propose his Objections against Transubstantiation; which the Doctor did, urging them with a great deal of Strength, and I think in an unanswerable Manner; shewing that many Absurdities must follow the real Transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. What he said was to this Effect.

“ That,

" That, whereas Mr. *Morgan* urged the
 " literal Sense of the Words, *This is my*
 " *Body*, he agreed that the literal Sense of
 " Scripture was to be adher'd to, unless the
 " literal Sense conveyed to us an impro-
 " per or absurd Meaning. In this Case,
 " according to all just Rules of Interpreta-
 " tion, the literal Sense must be given up,
 " and Scripture interpreted in a figurative
 " Manner. That this must be the Case in
 " the Text under Debate, because if we
 " explained it in a literal Manner, many
 " great Inconveniencies would evidently
 " follow. Particularly, it would invali-
 " date the Testimony of the Senses, in
 " Matters about which they were the pro-
 " per Judges; and that one Consequence
 " of this would be, that it would weaken
 " that Part of the Evidence for the Truth
 " of Christianity, which arises from Mira-
 " cles, which were properly an Appeal to
 " the Senses of those before whom they
 " were wrought. Farther, the literal Sense
 " would imply many great Absurdities,
 " viz. That the same individual Body of
 " Christ must be multiplied; since he must
 " have one Body to speak the Words of
 " Consecration, and to give out to the Dis-
 " ciples what they were to eat, and ano-
 " ther Body to be given to them, and to
 " be eaten by them, even whilst at the
 " same time he stood whole and uneaten
 " before

“ before their Eyes: That if the Words,
 “ *This is my Body*, were to be understood
 “ literally, those other Words of the Insti-
 “ tution, *This Cup is the New Testament*
 “ *in my Blood*, ought to be understood in a
 “ literal Manner also; which would im-
 “ ply this farther Absurdity, that the Cup
 “ was a New Testament, or that the Cup
 “ and not the Wine was transubstantiated
 “ into Christ’s Body and Blood, or into the
 “ New Testament in Christ’s Blood: That
 “ it was very usual with the sacred Writers
 “ to make use of figurative Expressions,
 “ which were well understood by the
 “ Jews; as when the Paschal Lamb was
 “ called *the Lord’s Passover*, and our Sa-
 “ viour calls himself *a Door*, and *a Vine*:
 “ And finally, that Saint Paul calls the
 “ Elements *Bread* and *the Cup* after the
 “ Consecration, in the very Account he gives
 “ of the Nature of this Institution. *As*
 “ *oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this*
 “ *Cup, ye do shew the Lord’s Death till he*
 “ *come*. And in another Passage, 1 Cor.
 “ x. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless,*
 “ *is it not the Communion of the Blood of*
 “ *Christ? The Bread which we break, is it*
 “ *not the Communion of the Body of Christ?*”

As here were many Arguments thrown
 together, Mr. Morgan said, he believed his
 Memory would scarce be able to recollect
 them in their Order. The Chairman told
 him,

him, that his Place obliged him to find one that could; but that if both their Memories should fail, he hoped some of the Company would assist them herein. This is unhandsomely termed, the Chairman's *Sage Advice*.

P. 24.

I. He then repeated Dr. *Hunt's* first Objection to Mr. *Morgan*, viz. "That the supposing the Bread and Wine transubstantiated into Christ's Body and Blood, according to the literal Sense of the Words, *This is my Body*, would invalidate the Testimony of the Senses, in Matters about which they are proper Judges."

Mr. *Morgan* sagely replied, That the Senses were not the proper Judges of the Thing in Question, and that it fell not under their Cognizance; because the Accidents only fell under the Notice of the Senses, and not the Substance. That we knew not the Essence or Substance of any Thing; and that therefore Transubstantiation did not properly invalidate the Testimony of the Senses, because they were Accidents only which appeared to them, and not the real Substance contained under them. That it was plain the Senses judged only of Accidents; because, if you take Bread and Stone, and say soft Bread, or white Stone, 'tis not of the Substances that you predicate either: And that this was so well known, that it was a Rule amongst

mongst the Logicians: That even a Dutch Logician, Burgersdicius, could say: Quid est Substantia? Substantia est aliquid per se subsistens, & subsistans accidentibus. He added, That the Senses were not always safely to be relied on; for that they sometimes made erroneous and false Reports: As, when we looked from a Tower, on Men walking beneath us, the Senses represent them not so tall as really they are: If we put a strait Stick in the Water, it will appear crooked; or if we look at any Object through a Mist, it will appear bigger than it really is. From these Instances he concluded, that the Testimony of the Senses is not always to be trusted to.

To this Dr. Hunt replied: " That in the
 " Judgment formed by our Senses, we must
 " always suppose them duly qualified, and
 " the Objects placed in a proper Medium;
 " and that then these very Instances would
 " prove, that we might safely depend on
 " the Report of our Senses, when all Things
 " were rightly circumstanced; because it
 " was by that Report which the Senses
 " constantly gave, that we were able to
 " correct by our Judgment these false Ap-
 " pearances. For Instance: When Men,
 " beheld from an Eminence, appear less
 " than what they really are, 'tis because
 " the Angle of Vision is altered, from
 " what we see them in when we are near
 " them. That, as to the Stick, it appeared
 " crooked

“ crooked through the Medium of Water,
 “ because that altered the Reflection of the
 “ Rays of Light upon the Eye. The same
 “ he alledged as to the Mist; arguing, that
 “ as the Judgment corrected by the very
 “ Senses these false Appearances, their
 “ Testimony was good, and ought to be
 “ depended on.” And indeed, to make
 these Instances prove any thing to the Ca-
 tholick Gentleman’s Argument, he should
 prove, that after the Consecration of the
 Bread, the Medium, or Angle of Vision,
 is some how or other altered, as in the
 Cases before-mentioned; or that there is
 some Defect in the Eye, whereby that
 which is really an human Body, appears to
 us only plain Bread. If there be no Alte-
 ration in any of these Things, the Senses
 are an equal Judge in the Case of Transub-
 stantiation, as in all other; and are as cer-
 tainly able to correct the false Represen-
 tation of this Doctrine by the Papists, as
 they are the false Representation of the
 Stick in Water: A Doctrine that will never
 be believed by any, but those who look
 through the Medium or Mist of *an implicit*
Faith; which hath a wondrous Faculty of
 making the most crooked Things appear
 strait, the largest Things appear little, and
 the most incredible Things *worthy of all*
Acceptation and Belief.

The Doctor farther replied, " That with
 " regard to the Accidents of Body being only
 " subject to the Senses, it was very true, as
 " the Catholick Gentleman asserted; no
 " Man, that he knew of, pretending to see
 " Substances themselves. But how do you
 " judge, says he, that there are different
 " Substances, but by the different Acci-
 " dents which attend them? How are
 " you sure that Bread is not Stone, or Stone
 " Bread, but by the discerning of their dif-
 " ferent Accidents? If there be no other
 " Way but this to judge of different Sub-
 " stances, we may safely pronounce of the
 " Substances by their Accidents; or else
 " we must suppose, either that the Acci-
 " dents inhere in nothing; or else, that
 " there is but one single Sort of Substance,
 " that exhibits all the different Sorts of
 " Accidents: Either of which will be more
 " than you will be willing to allow, and
 " will overthrow the Doctrine of Tran-
 " substantiation." The Truth is, that this
 is the most wonderful of all Doctrines, and
 is built upon a Scheme of Philosophy, that
 nothing can ever equal: For, it not only
 supposes Accidents, peculiar to particular
 Substances, may subsist without those Sub-
 stances; but that Substances may also sub-
 sist without their inseparable and distinguish-
 ing Accidents, or Properties. And when
 the Catholick Gentleman will please to
 support

support his Philosophy, I shall make no great Difficulty to embrace this Part of his Scheme of Divinity.

I have on this Article only farther to observe, that though the Gentleman calls his Narrative, *the Conferences truly stated*, he hath quite omitted this Part of the Debate: Whether through a Defect of his Memory, or a Desire to conceal this curious Philosophy from the sceptical Wits of the present Age, or for what other Reasons, I shall not presume to determine. But to proceed:

The Catholick Gentleman, Mr. *Morgan*, in order to invalidate the Evidence of the Senses, farther urged, *That if the Judgment had followed the Impression of Sense, it would have been mistaken at the Appearance of the Holy Ghost, immediately after our Lord's Baptism: For we read, that the Spirit of God descended like a Dove, Matt. iii. 16. or as St. Luke, Chap. iii. 22. expresses it, in a bodily Shape like a Dove.*

To this he tells us, in his *Conferences truly stated*, the Doctor is made to assert, *That their Senses, in the common Way of speaking, were deceived; and then very gravely subjoins, that they were not.* But it would have been more candid, had he told the World what Dr. *Hunt* really did say, than to make himself merry with what another injudicious Person makes him say.

Dr. *Hunt*'s Reply was this: " That he was
 " mistaken, in imagining there was the
 " real Appearance of a Dove; for that he
 " apprehended, that it was only the same
 " Glory, that frequently appeared under
 " the Old Testament, and was called the
 " *Shechinah*, that hovered over our Sa-
 " viour's Head like the hovering of a Dove."
 And he desired Mr. *Morgan* to read the Pas-
 sage; which he did: And after a little
 Pause over the Words, *σωματικῶς εἶδεν, ὡς*
περιεπερυν, he frankly and ingenuously own-
 ed the Words would bear Dr. *Hunt*'s Inter-
 pretation; and no longer insisted upon this
 Particular. This was fair and honest; and
 acknowledged as such by the Company.

But even supposing what appeared, was
 really the Form of a Dove; yet the Eyes
 were not deceived, in what they beheld;
 nor was the Judgment false, that was formed
 in Consequence of it. For whether we
 understand by *the Spirit*, the Spirit of God
 essentially, or the extraordinary Gifts of the
 Spirit, they are both equally invisible, and
 cannot appear to the bodily Eye: And
 therefore, whatsoever was beheld at our
 Saviour's Baptism, was not really the invi-
 sible Spirit of God, but a real Body; per-
 haps of Light or Glory (in the Form of a
 Dove, which the Eyes actually saw, and
 in seeing which they were not deceived)
 representing the Descent of the Holy Ghost
 upon

upon our blessed Lord, and the peculiar Gifts of his Grace which were vouchsafed him. So that the Testimony of the Senses holds good, and will always put the Doctrine of Transubstantiation quite out of countenance. 'Tis indeed the great Misfortune of this Doctrine, that 'tis not capable of being proved, because Sense and Reason are both equally against it.

2. The second Article proceeded on was, such Expressions of Scripture, as were of a like Nature with that under Debate: *This is my Body*. Dr. Hunt alledged, " That the following Words of Institution, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, must be understood in a figurative Sense; otherwise the Cup would be the New Testament, which was absurd: That Christ calls himself *a Door* and *a Vine*; and that the Paschal Lamb was called *the Lord's Passover*, though it was only the Memorial of that Event."

Mr. Morgan replied, That *he allowed a Figure in the Expression*, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; and that the Words in St. Mark, το περι πολλων εχνομορον, might be referred to ποσηριον, which evidently shewed that the Cup was by an easy Figure put for the Wine in it. That this was a Figure well understood, and in common Use even now; it being usual to say, Will you drink a Glass? But that it did
not

not follow, that because Figures were allowed in some Cases, therefore they must in all.

Dr. Hunt asked him, " Why do you allow a Figure in the Expression, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, but because of the Absurdity which will follow a literal Interpretation? If then the like Absurdities will follow from a literal Interpretation of the Words, *This is my Body*; why should you not allow a figurative Interpretation also; since both the Expressions are equally Part of the Institution?"

In answer to this, Mr. Morgan asked, *Whether it was probable that our Lord, when alone with his Apostles, and on the point of quitting them, would have spoken to them in a figurative or metaphorical Sense, without the least Hint of an Explanation?* And to this, he tells us, *no direct Answer was given.* If there had been none, he must excuse me if I tell him the Reason why; and that is, because it deserved none. Dr. Hunt answered, " That the Expression, *This is my Body*, needed no more Explication than the other, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.*" And this was a direct Answer; because the Expressions, *This is my Body*, and *this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, were plain in themselves, and needed no Words to make

make them plainer. What, did the Apostles want an Instructor, to tell them that a *Cup* was not a *new Testament*? Or, that they did not eat up their Lord, whom they actually saw before their Eyes? The Apostles knew too well the Difference between the Cup and the Wine in it; between an human Body and a Piece of Bread, to need any Information from Christ about it: And though Parables, which are Representations of Facts and Truths, under fictitious Names and Circumstances, may for this Reason often want Explanation; yet when our Saviour gave them Bread, and said, *Take, eat, this is my Body*; this was Language they well understood; for they had been used to say of the paschal Lamb, *this is the Lord's Passover*, though they knew that Lamb was only a Memorial of the true original Passover.

Besides, what have we now to do with our Saviour's private Explications to his Apostles, which he hath not thought fit to transmit to us? The real Question is, not what Christ privately interpreted to his Disciples, which they have not told us any thing of; but how we are to understand two Passages of Scripture spoken by our Saviour at the same Time, upon the same Occasion, and in reference to the self-same Institution? Expressions, which if literally understood, are both full of Contradictions

and palpable Absurdities; and yet which, if understood in a figurative Sense, both afford us a very easy, plain, and significant Meaning.

Mr. *Morgan* allowed, that the Words, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, were a figurative Speech. Why? why because 'twould be absurd to say, that a Cup was a New Testament, and that this Cup, or this Testament, was in Christ's Blood. But why is it more absurd, to say a Cup is a Testament, than that ~~the~~ this Thing, which I hold in my Hand, is my Body? This Piece of Bread is my Body? 'Tis a Speech that implies a thousand Contradictions. Since then both the Expressions literally understood are absurd, they are both equally to be interpreted figuratively; and when Mr. *Morgan*, or any of his Brethren the Priests, can prove, that the Words, *This is my Body*, are to be literally understood, I will undertake by the same Arguments to prove the same of the other Words, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*. So that if Mr. *Morgan* will insist on it, that a Piece of Bread is in the Sacrament transubstantiated into Christ's Body, I do in my turn insist, that the Cup, whatsoever becomes of the Wine in it, is transubstantiated into the New Testament in Christ's Blood. And when I can have the Pleasure to see him swallow the Cup
as

as well as the Bread, I will certainly believe the proper and real Transubstantiation of the Cup into the New Testament, as well as the Transubstantiation of the Bread into Christ's Body.

But Mr. *Morgan* farther replied to the Argument, concerning the figurative Sense of the Words, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; that the Metaphor or Figure was in the wrong Place, and that no conclusive Argument could be drawn from a Part to the Whole. Thus the right Hand of the Father in the Creed is certainly a Metaphor. But doth it thence follow, that every, or any one other Article of the Creed is therefore metaphorical? To which Dr. *Hunt* answer'd, " That if there are several Expressions, which if understood in a literal Sense, would each of them imply a real Absurdity, it will follow by a Parity of Reason, that if one of them is to be understood in a figurative Sense, all of them are to be understood so too; especially if that figurative Sense be plain, obvious, and natural. And therefore if all the Articles of the Creed implied, according to their literal Meaning, a Sense that could not be any more literally true, than that Article which ascribes to God a right Hand; common Sense would force us to interpret them all figuratively." And this must be allow'd, unless

we would make the Creed as palpable Nonsense and Absurdity as the Papists do the Sacrament. And of Consequence this Instance of the Creed proves just nothing. For 'tis as absolutely declared by Christ, that *the Cup is the New Testament*, as that *the Bread is his Body*. They are both equally possible to be true. The Contradiction in the one is not greater than in the other; and therefore if he will have a Body he must have a Cup, and let him swallow both, or neither, at his Pleasure. The Doctor therefore put the Figure in the right Place, and the Priest will never be able to remove it thence.

As to the Instance of the Paschal Lamb's being called the Passover, though the Gentleman gave no sufficient Reply to this at the Conference, yet he grows witty in his printed Account, and tells us, that the saying, *the Angel's passing over the Houses of the Israelites was the real Passover*, is a notable Discovery, and truly worthy a Doctor in Divinity. But I must tell him, that his Wit is ill placed, and that this Discovery will draw after it such a Consequence, as he will not be able easily to get rid of. For if the Angel's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites* be really the true Passover, then it follows, that when the paschal Lamb is call'd the Lord's Passover, 'tis called so, not because the Lamb was the Act of the
Angel's

Angel's passing over the *Israelites*, but a Memorial of that great Event; just as when the sacramental Bread is called the Body of Christ, it means the Memorial of that Body, and not the actual Conjunction of the Bread into that Body.

And this Mr. *Morgan* allows, when he asks: *Hath the Doctor, or his Amanuensis*, p. 26. *forgot, that the eating of the paschal Lamb was originally an Institution of a bare Memorial of the Angel's passing over, &c.* I suppose the Doctor hath not forgot it.

But suppose I should affirm, that the paschal Lamb was no Memorial of the Angel's passing over, but the very Act of the passing over it self; how will Mr. *Morgan* and his Friends convince me? Supposing I should argue like a good Catholick, that as the Words, *This is my Body*, prove, that in the Sacrament the Bread is transubstantiated into Christ's Body; so, in the Case under Consideration, the Words, *This is the Lord's Passover*, prove that the Lamb was metamorphosed into the Act of the Angel's passing over the *Israelites*: How am I to be convinced? Why, by no possible Arguments but such as will hold equally strong against Transubstantiation.

And therefore when Mr. *Morgan* asks, *What is all this to the Purpose, since the* ^{Ibid.} *Point in dispute is, whether the Eucharist be a bare Memorial or Figure of Christ's*

Death and Body? The Gentleman is entirely mistaken, since Dr. *Hunt* produced the Passage, *This is the Lord's Passover*, not to prove the Eucharist to be a Memorial, but only to shew this single Point; viz. That Things are said in Scripture to be, only what they are Representations or Memorials of; and that therefore when our Saviour says of the Bread, *This is my Body*, it can be no more argued from the Expression it self, that the Bread was transubstantiated into the Body, than it can be proved from those other Words, *This is the Lord's Passover*, that the paschal Lamb was really converted into the Angel's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites*. And when Mr. *Morgan* says the Words, *This is my Body*, cannot mean a Memorial or Figure of Christ's Death and Body, because Christ says expressly, 'tis *my Body*; this is really a begging of the Question, and such an Answer as could not be expected from the Mouth or Pen of a Priest or Jesuit; because the very Meaning of the Words is the Thing in question, and the Method and Rule of interpreting them the Point to be settled. Thus far then the Doctor may sing *Te Deum* for his Victory, nor will any one be able to wrest it out of his Hands.

3. The next Thing debated on was the Doctor's Argument, " That the Bread in
" the Sacrament was called Bread by Saint
" *Paul*

“ *Paul* after Consecration.” *Mr. Morgan* publicly allowed in the Company ’twas called so three Times ; and *Dr. Hunt’s* Argument from it was, “ That therefore it “ still remained Bread after Consecration, “ and was not transubstantiated into *Christ’s* “ Body.” This our Jesuit calls, *A pleasant Consequence*. I’ll do him the Justice to allow he is a pleasant Fellow, and am almost sorry I am forced to spoil his Mirth.

He imagines that he quite demolishes the Doctor’s Argument, by asking, *Are* ^{Ibid.} *the Words* referr’d to any Part of the Form of Consecration? And says, *If not, they are not to the Doctor’s Purpose*. A pleasant Consequence! If *Saint Paul* calls that, which was Bread before the Consecration, Bread after the Consecration, then one would imagine, that *St. Paul* thought it Bread as much after that Consecration as before ; and *Mr. Morgan* will have a great Difficulty to prove *St. Paul* thought otherwise. What, did *St. Paul* call it one Thing when he knew it to be another? Had he called the consecrated Element Bread in *Italy* or *Spain*, he could scarce have escaped the Discipline of the Inquisition.

But supposing there is some Strength in the Observation, that when *St. Paul* calls the Element Bread, ’tis not referr’d to any Part of the Form of Consecration ; I believe

it will be easy to prove, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation can never be proved from the Words, *This is my Body*. Let us have recourse to the Institution: *Jesus took Bread, and blessed it, 1 Cor. xi. 16. and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, Take, eat.* 'Tis plain from hence, that Jesus took *Bread*; and if the Form of Consecration consisted in these Words, *This is my Body*, 'tis also plain, that he blessed *Bread*, brake *Bread*, and gave *Bread* to his Disciples. And after he had given them *Bread*, bid them take and eat *Bread*: For it must be still Bread, till after the Consecration. But if Christ bid them eat Bread, how came he to turn it into his own Body by a Form of Consecration? What did he order them to eat a Piece of Bread, and then force them to devour a living Body, Flesh, Blood, and Bones, at a single Morsel, in opposition to his own Order? What they took into their Hands, and were bid to eat, was certainly *Bread*; for the pretended Consecration was not made till after they had taken it. And therefore if the pronouncing the Words, *This is my Body*, was that Form of Consecration which turned the Bread into a Body, our Saviour's ordering them to eat Bread, was ordering them to do what he intended they should not do, and what they actually did not do.

But

But in truth the Words, *This is my Body*, were not the Form of Consecration used by Christ; but Words spoken in consequence of the real Consecration. The true Consecration of the Bread made by our Saviour, was previous to his breaking and distributing it, and to the Apostles taking and eating it; and consisted in *his blessing God* over the Bread, and giving Thanks to his heavenly Father. By this Act of Religion he separated it to the Purpose for which he intended it, to be typically or representatively his Body; and his giving it to his Disciples, and saying of it, *This is my Body*, was not making it any thing that it was not before, but declaring it to be, what by Blessing and Thanksgiving he had ordered and appropriated it to be. If there was any kind of Consecration, or Change made in the Elements by it, one would think it should have been the immediate Consequence of Christ's blessing it, before he made any Distribution of it; otherwise Christ distributed an unconsecrated Element, and blessed it without consecrating it. If the Element he distributed was consecrated, the Consecration consisted in his Act of Blessing and giving Thanks; and not in pronouncing the Words, *This is my Body*, after the Benediction. And by consequence, if it be any Argument, that when St. Paul calls the Element *Bread*, he did not mean that

it

it was Bread, because it did not refer to any Part of the Form of Consecration; it will follow, that when Christ says of the Element, *This is my Body*, he did not convert the Bread into his Body, because that Expression did not refer to any Part of the Form of the real Consecration.

Besides, allowing the Form of Consecration of the Bread to consist in the pronouncing the Words, *This is my Body*; yet if there be such an extraordinary Virtue and Efficacy in pronouncing them, I am apprehensive we shall prove more than Mr. *Morgan* will be ready to allow. For if the Form of consecrating the Bread is, *This is my Body*, the Form of consecrating the Wine must be, *This Cup is the New Testament*; and, by Consequence, there must be the same Efficacy in one Part of the Form of Consecration, as in the other: And this will, in spite of all his Arts to the contrary, introduce into the Sacrament a *metamorphosed Cup*, as well as *transubstantiated Bread*; which the Gentleman however doth not seem very willing to swallow, or think himself very able to digest.

But if this Fetch of the Form of Consecration will not do, Mr. *Morgan* hath another Way, by which he thinks to get clear of this Objection. He observed at the Conference, *That it was no uncommon Thing to call what is changed, by the Name of what*
it

it was before the Change. And he gave two Instances. 1. That the Water which our Saviour changed into Wine, is called *Water after the Change.* 2. Aaron's Rod is said to have swallowed up the Rods of the Magicians; which it could not do as a Rod, but only as a Serpent, into which it was changed: So that the Eucharist being called Bread after the Consecration, is no more a real Proof that it was not transubstantiated by a real Change, than that Aaron's Rod was not changed into a Serpent, because it was called a Rod afterwards. This is his Argument; and his Reflections on it are, 1. Dr. Hunt, it seems, was so civil, as to attempt no Reply to this. 2. That there was some room for a Triumph, on this Account; and that the Reader perhaps may not change his Mind, upon an impartial View of the Remainder of this Conference. But if Dr. Hunt was so civil as not to reply to this Objection, the true Reason must be because he knew the two Cases not to be parallel. And this Dr. Hunt did affirm: And whether the Gentleman hath any room for Triumph, I leave to every Man of common Sense to determine, after he hath exactly compared them; for they are as widely different, as seeing and not seeing can possibly make them.

As to the first of these Instances, I observe, that the Water converted into Wine is never called simply Water, after the

F

Change

Change of it. 'Tis called, *John ii. 9. The Water that was made Wine*; and, at the 10th Verse, 'tis actually called *good Wine*: So that Mr. *Morgan* seems to have taken this Instance upon the Authority of the Church, as he doth his Religion, without ever looking into his New Testament.

As to the other Instance, though 'tis true that the sacred Historian says, *that Aaron's Rod swallowed up the Magician's Rod*; yet the producing it is nothing to the Purpose. For though the Serpent was called a Rod, from what it was before its miraculous Change, yet it appeared to the Eyes to be a real Serpent, and they that saw it knew it to be so; for they saw one of the Serpents actually devour the rest, and so could be in no danger of mistaking it for a Rod, though called so after the Change from its original Nature. But now, after Consecration, the Bread appears to be still Bread: It appears so by its Form, Smell, and Taste; every Sense convinces the Receiver that 'tis still Bread: So that as St. *Paul* calls it Bread after the Consecration, it remained Bread, and did not appear an human, living Body. In like manner, had the converted Wine been called Water; yet, as it was real Wine, and had the Taste, the Smell, the Colour, and all the real, visible Properties of Wine, and the People at the Feast perceived it to be good Wine, 'twould have

have been no parallel Instance to the Case of the Sacramental Bread, which never appeared after its Consecration as a living, real Body. In the Instance also of the Rod, the Senses convinced the Beholder 'twas a Serpent. But in the Case of the Bread, the same Senses convince him 'tis as much Bread after the Consecration, as before. *Aaron's* Rod devoured the other Rods, and thereby shewed it self to be a living Serpent: But I never heard that the consecrated Bread ever devoured a Priest, or a Receiver; though they are so unconscionable, as to pretend to devour their Saviour. Let us see this same consecrated Host, this transubstantiated Wafer, speak, or eat, or walk like a Man, or do some human Action; and 'twill then be time enough to believe the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: Just as the Spectators saw the Transformation of the Rods into Serpents, and therefore believed them to be Serpents, because they really saw them to be so.

Had these two Cases been parallel, the Case of the Rod must have stood thus: That it was an invisible Serpent, under the Accidents of a Rod; just as the Papists tell us that the consecrated Wafer is Christ, under the Accidents of Bread. But, as it happens, the Serpents had the Accidents, as well as Nature of Serpents. They were not invisible Serpents, in the Form of Rods; but

the Form of the Rods was absolutely lost, and converted into the Form of Serpents. And therefore, when they are called Rods after their Change, the Spectators could not be deceived; because they saw them to be Serpents, and not Rods. Whereas, after the pretended Consecration, the Host is said to be Christ's Body, without any of the Accidents of that Body. If it is become Christ's substantial Body, 'tis a Body invisible; and looks so perfectly like Bread or a Wafer, that nothing can be more like it. And therefore when *St. Paul* calls the Element Bread after Consecration, every Man that sees it must take it to be Bread; because he sees it to be Bread, and not an human, living Body. Hath our Gentleman, now upon the whole, any reason to triumph about this History of the Rod? Rather, hath he not provided a Rod to correct his Assurance? I should say, a Serpent that hath quite devoured his consecrated Host?

Thus far have I given an Account of the Part *Dr. Hunt* bore in this Controversy, and hope have sufficiently vindicated his Arguments. It will now be expected that I should give a fair Representation of the Share I had in the Debate my self; which, whether it be fairly represented or no, by the Author of *the Conferences truly stated*, I leave to others to determine, when they have perused the following Account.

I might here take notice of the rude and Ungentleman-like Manner in which this Writer hath been pleased to treat me, without any other Provocation given him, that I know of, than my appearing against him in Defence of the Protestant Doctrine concerning the Sacrament. I appeal to all the Gentlemen present, as to my Behaviour during the Debate. Since that Time I have never seen him, nor exchanged a single Word with him. But I shall leave every thing that is personal, and only relate Matter of Fact; and endeavour to confirm the Arguments I made use of, against his Cavils and Objections.

The Catholick Gentleman begins his Account of the Debate betwixt himself and me, by some uncandid Representations of the Chairman; intimating, that *he did not* p. 29. *perform his Office well.* I know of no other Reason for this Reflection but one, which is, the Chairman's being sometimes obliged to remind him of the proper Point in Debate; which he appeared to forget, or wander from. When Dr. *Hunt* declined to dispute any longer, after he had been engaged above two Hours, and desired me to carry on the Debate, I publickly declared my self *unwilling to take it out of his Hands.* But being called on by the Company, I accepted it. One of the Gentlemen present proposed the Chairman should
keep

keep Order, as before: But Mr. Morgan said, *There was no farther need of a Chairman, since he was appointed only to keep order between Dr. Hunt and himself, who was the only Person, with whom it was agreed he should dispute.* On this Dr. Smith acted no longer as Chairman; but said, he doubted not but the Gentlemen would observe good Order between themselves.

p. 29.

I began with resuming what, my Predecessor had said about the Passover: Concerning which, the Catholick Gentleman tells the World, *As that hath been already sufficiently answered, I shall not trouble my Reader with his Flourishes on that Subject, or the Catholick's Reply.* I do not wonder that he should decline entring on an Argument that he neither did, nor can support: However, he must excuse me, if I relate what passed on this Head.

When I urged, that "the Words, *This is the Lord's Passover*, could not mean any thing more, than that this is a Memorial of the Lord's Passover; and that therefore, by a like Rule of Interpretation, the Words, *This is my Body*, could signify nothing else, than that this is the Memorial of my Body;" he very gravely answered, *That there was a great Difference between the Passover and the Sacrament; which was a Thing of a very solemn Nature, and instituted by Christ himself, who was God.*

I replied: " That if he meant to throw
 " any thing of Solemnity on the Lord's
 " Supper, by using the Word *Sacrament*,
 " I should except against the Word, as not
 " being a Scripture one; for that I should
 " allow him nothing that he could not
 " prove." Nor did I object against that
 Word on any other Account. I added,
 " That his Observation about the Deity
 " of Christ, and the Institution of the
 " Lord's Supper by him, was nothing to
 " the Purpose: For supposing Christ to
 " be God, the Passover amongst the *Jews*
 " was instituted unquestionably by God
 " himself, the God of the *Jews*, the
 " Creator of Heaven and Earth, the one
 " only living and true God." To this he
 did not pretend to make any Answer, tho'
 he had leisure enough to have produced it,
 if he had found one ready.

I then farther observed, " That the
 " Words, *This is my Body*, interpreted in
 " the Popish Way, implied a Contra-
 " diction; and that therefore 'twas impos-
 " sible for God to transubstantiate a Wafer
 " into the Body and Blood of Christ, as
 " the Papists explain it." The Priest re-
 plied: *That the Power of God was Al-*
mighty; and that it was great Presumption
to pretend to say what God could, or could
not do.

To

p. 29.

To this he says I *smartly replied*, " That
 " God could not do some Things ;—such
 " as to lye, and deny himself, and make
 " Contradictions to be true : " And adds,
*Great News from the learned World ! but a
 little unseasonable.* But let the News be
 great or small, the Reply was perfectly sea-
 sonable. For as the Priest urged that 'twas
 Presumption to limit God's Power, I pro-
 duced those Instances to prove that 'twas
 not Presumption, in some Cases, to say
 God could not do this and the other Thing ;
 and that therefore he could not transub-
 stantiate the Bread into the Body and Blood
 of Christ, because that implied a real Con-
 tradiction. He says, had I attempted to
*prove this, it might have been somewhat to
 the Purpose.* I will therefore here oblige
 him, and demonstrate Transubstantiation
 to be a real Contradiction ; even the self-
 same Contradiction, as to affirm that a *Part*
is equal to the whole.

" Take therefore a consecrated Wafer,
 " and suppose it to be transubstantiated *
 " into the Body and Blood of Christ :
 " Divide the Wafer into *three*, or *three*
 " *thousand Parts*, and each Part, accord-
 " ing to the Popish Doctrine of *Conco-*
 " *mitancy*, is, by virtue of the original

* Totus Christus usque adeo tam in panis, quam in vini
 specie continetur. *Catech. ad Par. de Euchar. §. 33.*

“ Consecration †, as truly the Body and
 “ Blood of Christ, as the original Wafer;
 “ If then the whole consecrated Wafer was
 “ but the Body and Blood of Christ; and
 “ if, after the Division, each Particle is
 “ equally and substantially the very Body
 “ and Blood of Christ; then each Particle
 “ of the Wafer is equal to the whole Wafer,
 “ because each contains neither more nor
 “ less than the whole Christ: And, by
 “ Consequence, *the Part is equal to the*
 “ *whole.*” *Great News this, from the Po-*
pish World! I hope the Gentleman will
 allow this to be something to the Purpose:
 And I think I may, without Rashness, af-
 firm that Transubstantiation, which im-
 plies this Contradiction, is one of those
 Things which God cannot do; and which,
 therefore, cannot be true. I know not,
 indeed, whether the Gentleman makes any
 difficulty of swallowing a Contradiction;
 or whether he is not of opinion, that the
 Power of the Priest exceeds that of God,
 and can make, what God himself cannot
 do, both Parts of a Contradiction to be
 true: For he speaks with great Reserve and
 Caution about it. *Had Mr. Chandler; says*
he, condescended to prove that Transubstan-
tiation was one of those Things which God

† Neque vero illud prætermittendum, non solum in utraque
 specie, sed in quavis utriusque speciei particula totum Chri-
 stum contineri. *Catech. ad Par. &c. § 35.*

cannot do, it might have been somewhat to the Purpose. He is not quite sure, whether it would have been fully to the Purpose: *It might have been so.* 'Tis probable; but not certain, it seems. As to his Quotation from Bishop Forbes, 'tis of no Authority: For if Transubstantiation be a real Absurdity and Contradiction, 'tis no Object of Power; and therefore it can be no Presumption to affirm that God cannot do what is impossible to be done, or to restrain the Power of God to such Things only, as are the Objects of Power. But to proceed:

The Priest urged, in favour of Transubstantiation, that Passage of St. Paul; *He that eats and drinks unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* But how can this be, if the Elements be not transubstantiated into Christ's Body and Blood? Challenging me, at the same Time, to produce any Text, where the Body or Blood of Christ was spoken of in this manner, and yet was to be understood in a figurative manner.

I immediately produced that Passage, Heb. x. 29. *Who hath trodden under Foot the Son of God; and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy Thing:* Adding, "That as
 " Persons are here charged with trampling
 " under Foot the Blood of the Son of God,
 " and accounting it an unholy Thing,
 " though

" though they did not trample under foot
 " Christ's material Blood, but only despise
 " it in the Virtue and Efficacy thereof;
 " in like manner, Persons may be guilty
 " of the Body and Blood of Christ, who
 " receive the Memorials of it in an unbe-
 " coming Manner, as the *Corinthians* evi-
 " dently did, whom the Apostle charges
 " with eating and drinking to Excess at the
 " Lord's Supper."

Upon this the Priest looked grave, and
 made a long Pause; but rais'd no manner of
 Objection to the Texts being parallel: And
 I believe every one of the Company per-
 ceived that he found himself under a Diffi-
 culty. Yea, in the *Conferences truly stated*,
 he seems to own it himself; but in a very
 rude and disingenuous Manner: For he
 says, *I do not remember what Answer was* ^{p. 302}
made to this; or whether the Catholick Gen-
tleman was permitted to make any. For all
the Company must remember that Mr. Chand-
ler, who is a Person of a ready Utterance,
and is blessed with some other pretty Quali-
fications for an Orator, took the Liberty of
pouring out so profusely, that he was desired
not to preach, but sit down, and argue coolly
and regularly. The Priest did, I confess,
once desire me not to preach; but it was
not on this Occasion, but on another, which
shall be mentioned presently, and on a Sub-
ject which I am confident he did not relish,

and had rather I had let alone. Nor do I wonder that his Memory fails him on this Occasion; for he really made no Reply for a considerable while, nor had any at all to make that was to the Purpose.

As to the Expression of *discerning the Lord's Body*, which he urged as a Proof that the Lord's Body was actually present, I told him, "that no such Inference could be fairly drawn; because that the Words naturally meant, that they took the Bread and Wine at the Sacrament as common Bread and Wine, without considering the Relation they had to the Body and Blood of Christ, which were the great Things signified and represented by them." And that this must be the Meaning, is very evident; because, supposing the Body of Christ actually present, as the Gentleman affirms, yet the discerning the Body of Christ, can never be meant of discerning with the bodily Eyes. For though a Popish Priest pretends to convert the Bread into Christ's Body, he never pretends to make that Body visible to the Eyes: And 'tis therefore no more a Difficulty to suppose, that the Expression of *discerning the Lord's Body*, should mean a considering the Relation which the Bread hath to Christ's Body, as a Memorial of it, though that Body be not actually present; than it is to suppose it means the Discernment of

a Body actually present, that is really invisible; since 'tis plain that the Discernment, in both Cases, relates to the Mind only, and not to the bodily Organs of Sight; and that therefore the Expression must be understood in a figurative Sense. And it will be a curious Discovery, when our Priest will condescend to inform the World, how an invisible Body can be otherways seen, or what other way a Man can discern a Body which he can't see, but by considering it, or thinking of it, when represented by some Memorial or Sign of it.

But how great a Difficulty soever this may be, and how much soever at a Loss our Priest was at the Conference about the Text under Debate, he hath since thought better of it, and very kindly puts Words into my Mouth. "To make my Comparison compleat," he affirms, I should have said: *As one is said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ who takes the Eucharist unworthily, which is only a Sign or Figure of Christ's Body and Blood; so, &c. which however,* he adds, *would have been begging the Question.* But the Gentleman should remember, that Protestants don't love to be dictated to, and that I never urged the Words of the Apostle to the Corinthians, *He that eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,* to explain those to the Hebrews, *Who*
batb

bath trodden under Foot the Son of God, and counted the Blood of the Covenant an unholy Thing; but that on the contrary, I produced this Passage out of the *Hebrews* as parallel to that in the *Corinthians*, and to shew, that the former would afford us a true Explication of the latter. And therefore I should have said what I actually did say, viz. " That as a Person who never
 " did trample under his Foot the real Body of Christ, or his material Blood, may
 " be yet said to *tread under Foot the Son of God, and count his Blood an unholy Thing,*
 " when he sinned wilfully or apostatized from Christianity, after he had received the
 " Knowledge of the Truth; so also may a
 " Person be said to be guilty of the Body
 " and Blood of Christ, and not to discern
 " them, when he receives the Eucharist, if
 " he eats the Bread, and drinks the Wine,
 " as common Bread and Wine, without
 " ever regarding them as Memorials of
 " Christ's Body and Blood; especially when,
 " as the *Corinthians* did, he drinks of the
 " Eucharistical Wine to Excess and Drunkenness, and so converts that sacred Institution of the Supper into an Occasion
 " of Sin, which was intended by our blessed Saviour to put Men in mind of their
 " Obligations, as Christians, to depart
 " from all Iniquity." This surely is not
 begging the Question. For the Question
 is,

is, How the Words of Institution in the Sacrament are to be understood? And, whether there are any parallel Expressions of Scripture that justify the Protestants in their Interpretation of them? The Passage I have produced is exactly parallel, and therefore we may be allowed to call what is given and received in the Eucharist, *Elements, Memorials, Bread and Wine*, without being charg'd with begging the Question; especially as an inspired Apostle calls them Bread and Wine even after Consecration. The Priest himself begs the Question, when he will not allow us to call them Elements, and cannot prove them to be the Body and Blood of Christ.

But to shew, that the being *guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ* did not refer to the *Corinthians* getting drunk at the Sacrament, the Priest urged, *That these Abuses* ^{p. 31} *happen'd at their Agapæ or Love Feasts, which he affirmed, were before the Eucharist*; and he tells the World, that he hath considered that Matter, and is still of Opinion, that at the Time when Saint Paul wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians* those Repasts did precede the Eucharist, and that the Chapter under Consideration is a full Proof of that Practice.

But I endeavour'd to shew at the Conference, "That the Abuses which the Apostle endeavour'd to rectify amongst the
Corin-

“ *Corinthians* happen’d at the Sacrament
 “ it self; because the Apostle endeavours
 “ to rectify them, by setting before them
 “ the Nature and Design of the Institution,
 “ without saying one single Word about
 “ the Love Feasts:” And upon a Review
 of the Chapter I am abundantly confirmed
 in that Sentiment; though I am very sen-
 sible the Catholick Gentleman is not singu-
 lar in his Opinion. For the Apostle intro-
 duces his Account of the *Eucharist* in this
 1 Cor. xi. Manner. *When ye come together into one*
 20. *Place, this is not to eat the Lord’s Supper.*
 21. *For in eating (the Lord’s Supper) every one*
taketh before other, his own Supper: And
 22. *one is hungry, and another is drunken. What,*
have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in?
Or despise ye the Church of God, and shame
them that have not? From which Words,
 I think nothing can be more plain, than
 that St. Paul reprehends them for mista-
 king the Nature, and abusing the Design
 of the Lord’s Supper. The *Corinthians*
 seem’d to have imagin’d, that it was no-
 thing more than common eating and drink-
 ing at an ordinary Meal, and therefore
 without regarding the great Thing intend-
 ed by it, the rich Part of the Congregation
 drank to excess, and sent the Poor empty
 away. And therefore, says the Apostle, *when*
ye come together into one Place, when ye as-
 semble for these Purposes of Uncharitable-
 ness

ness and Drunkeness, and to eat and drink as at a common Meal, *this is not to eat the Lord's Supper.* And then to shew them what the great Intention of that Supper was, he gives them an Account of that Institution as he received it from Christ; and expressly confines the being *guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, to the eating *that Bread, and drinking that Cup of the Lord unworthily*; by which they did *shew the Lord's Death till he come.* See Verses 26, and 27.

Besides, as the *Agapæ*, or *Love Feasts*, were not properly religious, but civil Entertainments; never appointed by Christ, nor intended to *shew forth his Death*; they neither could, nor ought to *discern the Lord's Body*, in what they eat or drank there. For the Papists do not pretend that either the Bread or Wine, at the Love Feasts, were transubstantiated into Christ's Body and Blood; or that they ought to have been discerned at those Festivals: And, by consequence, *the unworthy eating and drinking* could not, I think, refer to the Love Feasts; but to their disorderly and sinful eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper.

This *unworthy eating and drinking*, spoken of by the Apostle, seems to consist in this: That they eat and drank of the Bread and Wine at the Sacrament, as common

H

Things:

Things: That they did it without considering the Relation they had to Christ's Body and Blood, or regarding them as Memorials of his Death and Absence: That they drank to Excess: And that tho' they should all of them, Rich and Poor, have communicated together, as Members of Christ's Body; yet the Rich neglected the Poor, and sent them away without the Bread and Wine, or at least a Sufficiency of either. These Things are plainly intimated by the Apostle. Now if the Apostle reprehends them for their Misbehaviour only at the Love Feasts, and not for the Sins they were guilty of at the Sacrament; this could be in no proper Sense the Crime of being *guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ*: Nor could they *eat and drink Damnation to themselves*, for *not discerning*, in this Feast, what was in no Sense present at it, *the Lord's Body*. And yet so grievous was this Crime they were guilty of, that the Apostle tells them, *For this Cause many are weak and sickly amongst you, and many sleep*. Now, I imagine, few will affirm that these immediate Judgments, inflicted by God, were inflicted as Punishments for Disorders committed at an ordinary Entertainment; though they will appear necessary Severities, if considered as made use of to punish the Abuses of a divine Institution, and to maintain the Dignity of it in the

I

Christian

Christian Church, at its first Establishment in the World.

Besides, if, as the Catholick Gentleman tells us he observed, *these Excesses were* P. 31. *committed in the Meals, which the first Christians took before the Eucharist*; how comes the Apostle to tell them, *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*? Did the first Christians imagine that these previous Meals, and the Lord's Supper, were the same Thing? Or, with what Propriety did he give them an Account of a *religious Institution*, to rectify the Disorders they were guilty of at a *civil Entertainment*? The proper Way would have been to have forbidden these Love Feasts intirely, as was afterwards done, upon account of these Abuses; or else to have warned them against the Abuses at this Festival expressly, and by name; and not preposterously to have endeavoured to bring them to Sobriety and good Order at a *civil Feast*, by telling them the Design of a *religious Institution*, that had no Dependance on, or real Connection with it.

But supposing these Disorders happened, though there is not a single Intimation that they did, at the Love Feasts; how will this prove that the being *guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and not discerning the Lord's Body*, make for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation? The Question is,

how these Words are to be understood ? I urged at the Conference, " in the same " figurative Manner, as the Words at " *ver. 29. He that eateth and drinketh un-* " *worthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation* " *to himself.*" I asked the Priest, " How " a Man could eat and drink Damnation ? " Whether literally, or no?" But the Man was mute, and either could not, or would not tell me; and, I must do him the justice to say, did not pretend that any thing was transubstantiated into Damnation, for a bitter Morsel to swallow by the unworthy Receiver. And when he will vouchsafe to tell the World, how any Man can *eat and drink Damnation*; he may tell them too, what it is to *eat Christ's Body*, and to be *guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.*

As to the Time when these Love Feasts were celebrated, either before or after the Lord's Supper, there is nothing in this Passage to the *Corinthians* to determine it. The Catholick Gentleman affirmed *it was before*; I told the Company I apprehended *it was after the Lord's Supper.* And, I think, 'twas generally after; especially in the earliest Ages of the Church. For thus *Pliny* * represents it, in the Accounts he

* Adfirmabant — se Sacramento — obstringere — quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium. *Ilin. Epist. lib. 10. epist. 97. Edit. Cort. et Longol.*

had from the Christians themselves. For having said, that they met on the Lord's Day to sing Hymns to Christ, and bind themselves by a Sacrament to do no Evil; 'tis added, *WHEN THIS IS DONE, our Custom is to depart, and meet again to partake of an Entertainment; but that a very innocent one, and common to all.* 'Tis plain, from hence, that the Communion was first, and the *Agapæ* some time after. And thus *Tertullian* †, who gives a particular Account of these *Agapæ*, speaks of *Lights*, and *worshipping God by night* at these Entertainments: Which shews they were after the Communion; which was received in the Morning, and generally, if not always, fasting. And *Socrates* ‡, the ecclesiastical Historian, speaking of the *Egyptians*, tells us, *That they celebrated the Mysteries; not according to the Custom of Christians, because they communicated after they had feasted, and satisfied themselves with all kind of Meats.* And if he hath that Regard for the Fathers which he ought to have, I will produce him an Authority, to prove that these *Corinthians* themselves first received

† Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum Deum sibi esse. — Post aquam manuaem et lumina — provocatur in medium Deo canere. *Apolog. cap. 39.*

‡ Οὐχ' ὡς εἶδος δὲ χριστιανοὶ τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εὐωχῆσθαι, καὶ παντοίων ἐδεσμάτων ἐμφορηθῆναι — τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι. *Lib. 5. c. 22.*

the Sacrament; and after that had their *Agapæ*, or *Love Feasts*. 'Tis that of *Theophylact* ||; who, in his Comment on 1 Cor. xi. 17. hath these Words: *That the Corinthians, on certain stated Days, probably on their Holy Days, feasted in common, after they had partaken of the Mysteries.* 'Twere easy to confirm this Matter by more Testimonies, from *Theodoret*, *Chrysostom*, and others: But, however, this is not material. To proceed in my Relation:

The Catholick Gentleman observed, in the Course of the Debate, *That the Words of Consecration, This is my Body, did not only prove the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; but that the Expression, This do in Remembrance of me, was a Command or Commission to the Apostles, in after Times, to consecrate the Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ.* I replied: " That this
 " could not be the Meaning of them; and
 " that a Child might see they referred to
 " the eating and drinking at the Sacrament
 " in remembrance of Christ, by the immediate Connection of them with Christ's
 " Command to do this." And this appeared so fully convincing to the Catholick Gentleman, that he fairly gave up this Point, and no farther insisted on it. 'Twas never

|| Εν Κορινθῶ κοινῇ εὐχαρίστο μετὰ τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῶν μυστηρίων.

pretended that he allowed the Sacrament to be a bare, empty Remembrance or Memorial.

After these Things had been thus for a considerable while debated, I told the Catholick Gentleman, " That it would be " a shorter way to consider the Words of " the Institution themselves; and that he " could not prove the Doctrine of Tran- " substantiation from any single Passage of " Scripture, literally understood, in the " whole of it." The Gentleman said, *This was strange*; and immediately read out of St. Matthew, *Το εστι το σωμα μου, This is my Body.* I desired him to read on; which he did: *Το διδομενον υπερ υμων, Which is given for you.* I also desired him to read the Words of Institution in the other Places: And, in particular, in the Epistle to the *Corinthians*; which he did; where we have, *Κλωμενον υπερ υμων, Which was broken for you.*

I then asked him, " Whether the Body, " which Christ gave to his Disciples, was " that same natural, individual Body of " his, that stood on the Earth, or reclined " at Supper; and with which he gave " himself to his Disciples?" He readily, and without hesitation, answered, *That 'twas his spiritual and glorified Body.* And thus he was obliged to answer, according to the Doctrine of the Catechism published by order of the Council of *Trent*, which thus

thus defines it: *Verum Christi Domini corpus; illud idem, quod natum ex Virgine, in cælis sedet ad dexteram Patris, hoc sacramento contineri.* 'Tis the true Body of our Lord Christ; the self-same, which was born of the Virgin, and sits at the Right Hand of the Father, that is contained in this Sacrament. De Eucharist. § 25.

To this I replied two Things. " 1. That
 " I apprehended it could not be his spi-
 " ritual Body, because Christ had no spi-
 " ritual or glorified Body till after his
 " Death and Resurrection. 2. That this
 " was going beyond *the Letter* of the Text,
 " which mentioned not one Word of a
 " spiritual and glorified Body; but spoke
 " only of the Body of Christ, which was
 " actually present with the Apostles. But
 " I told him I would not insist on either
 " of these; but rather chose to ask him
 " another plain Question, to which I de-
 " fired as plain an Answer; viz.

" What that Body was, which Christ
 " says *is given for*, or as St. Paul expresses
 " it, *is broken for you*; whether his na-
 " tural or spiritual Body?" Adding, " A
 " plain Answer to a plain Question, Sir:
 " I must pin you down to this."

This the Catholick Gentleman, who undoubtedly had Penetration enough to see the Difficulty to which I was going to reduce him, endeavoured for a long while

artfully to evade; by saying, that *the natural and spiritual Body were the same*; and asking me, *Whether our Bodies at the Resurrection would not be the same as now?* I replied: "This was no Answer to my Question; which I insisted upon." And though he says, *I understood my Business*, 33: *too well, to give an Answer to his Question*; yet I did really answer it; and allow, "that our Bodies at the Resurrection were not altogether the same with, but greatly different, in many Respects, from our present Bodies." And this Difference the Catholick Gentleman himself allows, when he represents himself as asking me: *Whether* p. 32. *our Bodies at the Resurrection would not be the same as now, as to the Matter, though different as to their Endowments?* For, if the Bodies of Men, at the Resurrection, have different Endowments from what our present Bodies have, then the Resurrection Bodies are so far different from our present Bodies; unless the Gentleman will please to affirm, that two Things, which differ from each other, are actually the same, even in those Respects in which they differ.

But as the Gentleman would have drawn me from my Point into a Dispute about *the Sameness of the Body*, I did not care to be taken with that Sleight; especially, as

he himself had allowed the Difference in his Answer to my first Question, by affirming, *That the Body which Christ gave to his Disciples at the Sacrament, was not his natural, but spiritual Body*: And therefore I once more insisted on a direct Answer to my Question. The Gentleman then said, it was *a real Body*: And it was a long time, before he would condescend to make any other Reply. At last, he did grant, in a sort of indirect Manner, that 'twas Christ's *natural Body*, which *he gave*, or which *was broken for his Disciples*.

Upon which I immediately observed,
 " That it could not be true, which he
 " had before asserted, that it was *the spi-*
 " *ritual Body* of Christ which he gave to
 " his Disciples; because it was directly
 " contrary to the Words of Christ, who
 " says that the Body, which he gave to his
 " Disciples, was the very Body which was
 " given or broken for them: *Take, eat;*
 " *this is my Body, which was broken for You:*
 " And that therefore, as 'twas *the natural*
 " *Body* of Christ which *was broken* on the
 " Cross, it must be the same *natural Body*
 " which *he gave* to his Disciples; and not
 " *his spiritual Body*, as the Gentleman had
 " asserted."

He

He replied: That *the Words, which is given, or which is broken for You, might, by an easy Figure, be understood, as meaning, which shall be given, or broken for You.* “No Figure, said I, I beseech you, Sir! You are to prove Transubstantiation from the *literal* Sense; and if you introduce one Figure, Protestants will think themselves allowed to introduce more, and justify their own figurative Interpretation of the whole Passage.”

This put an end to our Debate; for the Gentleman declined any farther Answer. The Reason which he gives for it, in his printed Account, is false and abusive. *Is a Man obliged, says he, to continue a* P. 33. *Dispute with a Person, who delights in multiplying Words; who rambles on by the Half Hour, without taking any notice of his Antagonist's Arguments or Questions; who, in fine, will be answered, before he hath made any Reply to what was asked him; and even after he had before had a plain Answer to all he pressed afterwards? If this be true, it must be allowed that my Antagonist was a Man of great Acuteness and Penetration, that could thus foresee all I had to say, and even answer me before I had said it. But the Truth is, the Gentleman was pushed home, and grows angry, and calls Names, because he was asked a few Que-*

stions he had not cunning enough to resolve, without contradicting the plain Sense of our Saviour's Words. He shuffled indeed, as dextrously as he could, for above Half an Hour; but being narrowly watched, he was forced at last to play himself out of the Game, and throw down the Cards. There was not a single Argument he produced, or Question that he asked, but I endeavoured openly and fairly to answer. If my Answer was at any time long, 'twas an Answer to as long a Discourse of his; which he always delivered without any material Interruption, and generally with none. He should not complain of Rambling, for that will put the Gentlemen, who were present at the Conference, in mind, that he several Times endeavoured to obscure and wander from the Point; especially when he found a Difficulty was near him, that he could not solve. 'Twere easy to make more just Reflections of this kind, on the Conduct of Mr. *Morgan*; but this is a Part of Controversy by no means agreeable to me: And I should have been wholly silent on this Head, had not the Gentleman forced from me what I have now said, by an injurious Representation of my Behaviour towards him.

After

After the Gentleman had declined any farther Debate, I could not help observing to the Company, "how exceeding odd the Interpretation of the Words of the Institution appeared, as the Gentleman had given it." *This is my Body*, says Christ, *which is broken for You*: i. e. as the Gentleman had explained it, *This, which I now give You, is my Body; not my natural Body, but my spiritual Body; tho' I can have no spiritual Body till after my Resurrection: And this my spiritual Body, which I give You, is broken for You; though 'tis not my spiritual Body, but my natural Body, which is, or which shall be given or broken for You.* I was going on to observe, how natural, easy, and consistent, the Protestant Interpretation was: But the Gentleman was pleased to interrupt me, by desiring me *not to preach*, nor make an Interpretation for him.

Upon this we agreed to put an end to the Conference, and enter into some more general and free Conversation.

But before we had seated our selves, another Gentleman in the Company, who is known to be a Priest, Mr. *Vaughan* by name, came to me in a very complaisant Manner, and said he differed from his Brother, Mr. *Morgan*, that had been arguing with me. For whereas that Gentleman
had

had affirmed, *'twas the spiritual, and not the natural Body, which Christ gave to his Disciples*; he, on the other hand, apprehended, *'twas his natural Body, in a spiritual manner*. But the Gentleman who had before managed the Controversy, said he would never give up that Point: For, says he, *St. Paul says, It was sown a natural Body, but raised a spiritual Body*.

I took occasion from hence to observe to the Company, “ That as the Gentlemen “ were not agreed what sort of Body it “ was, that Christ gave to his Disciples; “ whether a natural or a spiritual Body, “ or a natural Body in a spiritual manner; “ it was time enough for us Protestants to “ believe Transubstantiation, when they “ had settled that Point.” Upon which they were too prudent to carry on the Debate any farther.

But I do not see what advantage the Gentleman, Mr. *Vaughan*, who affirmed, that it was the natural Body of Christ in a spiritual manner, would gain hereby to his Cause. For what is a natural Body in a spiritual manner? If the Gentleman meant a Body with all its present natural Properties, that at the same Time was possessed of all spiritual Endowments and Qualities, 'tis an express Contradiction. Or, if he meant a real Body; as to the Truth and Sub-

Substance of it, with spiritual Endowments or Properties, 'tis no longer a natural, but a spiritual Body. And thus he'll differ from his *Brother*; not in Sense, but in Words only. But whatever was his meaning, 'twill stand him in no stead: For the Body of Christ, which was broken for us, was neither a spiritual Body, nor a natural Body with spiritual Properties; but his very natural Body, with all its natural Properties and Qualities remaining in it: And therefore this must be the Body which he gave to his Disciples, and no other, if the Words of Institution, *This is my Body which is broken*, are to be literally understood, according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

After the Conference was ended, and the Company was talking more at large, I said to the Catholick Gentleman who had been my Antagonist in the Debate, " That I could not but wonder at the Decision of the Council of *Trent*, which " had decreed that every distinct Part of " the Host and consecrated Wine, was " equally and truly the Body and Blood " of Christ with the whole of it." This he said was what was called the Doctrine of the *Concomitancy*; and wished the Council *had not entred into such Particularities, but had left that Matter more at large.* This
he

he spoke with very great Freedom, and without Reserve: Though he is pleased, in his printed Account, flatly to deny it. So that if there be any Mistake, it must be a Mistake of the Gentleman's Memory; for he did presume expressly to censure the Council in this Respect, though he now professes to abide by their Decisions.

The same Gentleman, Mr. *Vaughan*, who after the Conference was ended had told me, that *'twas Christ's natural Body in a spiritual manner*, which he gave to his Disciples at his first Supper, farther said: That *he apprehended 'twould be proper to consider what the Fathers had said concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; for that he thought their Opinion was of great Importance in this Affair.* I answered him, "That he knew that
 " Protestants took their Religion only
 " from the Bible, and not from the Fa-
 " thers: But, however, that I did not
 " decline the Appeal to them, though I
 " did not own them as authoritative and
 " decisive Judges." But whereas Mr. *Morgan* affirms, in his printed Account, that my last Words were these, *That tho' the Article in debate should be proved from the Fathers, I would recur to the plain Words of Scripture*; I must take upon me to deny it. For though the Fathers are,

1

and

and can be of no Authority, when they deliver Opinions contrary to Scripture; yet I do know that the Writings of the primitive Fathers have nothing in them to favour the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. And my last Words were these: *That provided the Fathers were not appealed to as authoritative Judges, I challenged the two Gentlemen present, who were supposed to be Priests, with as many more of that Number as they would bring, to prove the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, Name or Thing, from the Writings of the Fathers of the five first Centuries.* 'Twas what I denied; and I should lay it on them to shew the Affirmative.

The Challenge was immediately accepted. But the Catholick Gentleman (Mr. Morgan) who had managed the Conference, said, *It would take up some time to collect the several Passages out of them, relating to this Doctrine:* And therefore, though I desired that Day Fortnight might be fixed, or any set Time, to enter upon that Debate, yet none was really agreed on; but he told me he would let me know when he was ready. And as he farther objected against the Largeness of the Number that was then present; it was farther agreed, that there should be six only on each Side present. But I have

K

never

never heard of him, from that Time to this: Which, whether it be consistent with his Engagement, or whether he is over sure of his Cause, I leave to others to determine.

p. 36.

When the Gentleman, Mr. Morgan, affirms, that because *I would recur to the plain Words of Scripture, i. e. to my own Interpretation of them, a Dispute of this kind would have been of no Use or Service towards the Discovery of Truth, and that therefore he allowed it no farther Thought;* I must put him in mind, that the Meeting he agreed to, and the Challenge he accepted, was not to consider the Words of Scripture, but the Doctrine of the Fathers: And that though I shall ever abide by the Doctrine of the inspired Writers, as far as I understand it; yet if he could have proved the Doctrine of the *real Presence* from the Fathers, he would unquestionably have had fairly so far the Advantage over me. But I know the Fathers are against him; and that though they, some of them, use very strong Expressions, when they speak of the *Eucharist*, yet they never dreamt of *Transubstantiation*, nor the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*, nor the Popish Sacrifice of the *Mass*: Which are, comparatively speaking, modern Inventions, that have nei-
ther

ther Scripture nor genuine Antiquity to countenance and support them.

As to the Meeting, which is said, by the Person who published the first Account of the *Conferences*, to be desired and appointed at the same Place, on the 20th of the same Month; 'twas no fixed Appointment, that I remember; much less an Appointment to enter upon the Opinion and Sense of the Fathers. There was indeed an Intimation that some Persons would be there, though no Promise on the Part of the two Catholick Gentlemen. I attended; but not finding either of those Gentlemen there, soon left the Company.

Thus have I given an impartial Account of what passed at the Conference, at which I was present; which nothing should have prevailed on me to have done, but the Mistakes contained in the Account of *the Conferences truly stated*. As to the first Account of the *Conferences*, 'twas so very imperfect and confused, that I could scarce imagine it would have drawn a second from the Catholick Quarter. And though the Author of the second Account justly complains of the

Publication of the first, I do assure him I never knew of the Design, till I saw the Advertisement; nor ever knew a single Word that was contained in it, till after it was published; and cannot think either him or my self well used, by the Person who wrote it.

But, however, I have reason to complain in my Turn; not only for the rude Treatment I have received, in the last Account published by the Catholick Gentleman; but because I have seen a Letter from *Antwerp*, by which I am informed that a very injurious Account of this Conference hath been transmitted thither, boasting of a very signal and intire Victory over the Protestants and me. To say the least, this argues great want of Candour; and was a Treatment I by no means expected, from any who were present at it. But I have this Satisfaction, that whatever Advantage may have been gained over me (which can give no Man any great occasion of Triumph) or whatever Defects there were in my Arguing, the Protestant Doctrine of the Sacrament still remains firm and unshaken; and the Popish Tenet, of *the real Presence*, or *Transubstantiation*, will be found an Absurdity and Falsehood, if there be any
such

(77)

such thing as Truth in the World; or if we allow either our Senses, or our Reason, the Scriptures, or the primitive Fathers, to judge concerning it, or finally to determine it.

F I N I S.

B E R R A T U M.

Page 17, l. 24. for *Decretum*, read *Decretalium*.

**BOOKS lately Printed for J. GRAY, at the
Cross Keys in the Poultry, near Cheapside.**

Lambach's History of the Inquisition: Translated into English. By Samuel Chandler. To which is prefixed a large Introduction; containing the History of Persecution.

Mr. Locke, that incomparable Judge of Men and Books, gives this History the highest Character, and pronounces it a Work in its kind absolutely perfect. In a Letter to Mr. Lamborch himself, he tells him, That he had so fully exposed their secret Arts of Wickedness and Cruelty, that, if they had any Remains of Humanity in them, they must be ashamed of that horrid Tribunal, in which every thing that was just and righteous was so monstrously perverted; and that 'twas fit to be translated into the vulgar Language of every Nation, that the meanest People might understand the Antichristian Practices of that execrable Court. The Papists were so apprehensive of the Prejudices that might arise to their Cause by the Publication of this Book, that the Cardinals, Inquisitors General at Rome, condemned it by an Edict, and forbade the reading it, under the severest Penalties.

Mr. Chandler's two Letters to Dr. Berryman, in Vindication of his Introduction to the said History.

Sermons against Popery; preach'd at Salters Hall: By

J. Barker,	W. Harris, D. D.	J. Newman,
S. Chandler,	O. Hughes, D. D.	J. Earle, D. D.
D. Neal, M. A.	J. Hunt, D. D.	M. Lowman,
G. Smyth, M. A.	J. Bayes,	B. Grovesnor, D. D.
S. Wright, D. D.	J. Burroughs,	T. Leavelly.

In Two Volumes 8^{vo}. Price Ten Shillings.

F A Supplement to Plutarch: Or, The Lives of several eminent and illustrious Men, omitted by that Author, faithfully extracted from the Latin and Greek Historians. By Thomas Rowe. With a Preface, by Samuel Chandler. 8^{vo}.

An Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures; intended chiefly for young Students in Divinity. Written originally in French, by Messieurs de Beaujobre and Lensant; and done into English, with Additional Notes, by N. Tindal and P. Morant.

12 MR 58

The Credibility of the Gospel History; in Three Volumes, 8^{vo}. By N. Lardner.

The History of the Council of Constance, in two Vol. 4^{to}.

The Life of Mr. John Howe. By E. Calamy, D. D. 8^{vo}.

An Abridgement and Continuation of Baxter's Life and Times. By the same Author. In Four Volumes, 8^{vo}.

The Third Edition of, The Christian Oratory: Or the Devotion of the Closet display'd. By Benj. Bennet. 8^{vo}.

